DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 473 UD 028 227

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's Analysis of the Level of Compliance of Project CANAL's School Improvement Plans (1989-90).
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Jan 90
NOTE 84p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Control; Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Plans; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Management Development; *Participative Decision Making; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation analyzes the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) produced by the core planning teams of Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan to reduce inequities in predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools in Chicago (Illinois). CANAL's goal is to organize and train core planning teams to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The 41 teams were to develop SIPs, based on an analysis of school problems, to direct actions that would raise the levels of academic achievement. The following findings are presented: (1) no SIP was complete; (2) most SIPs displayed an inconsistency or an inadequacy between their plan and relevant information about the school's problems; (3) most of the SIPs failed to provide a process for disseminating and obtaining consensus on the plan from the school community; (4) 34 of the SIPs contained measurable objectives; and (5) although neither innovative nor unique, over half of these objectives focused directly on students. Statistical data are presented in three tables. The following materials are appended: (1) a list of references to expected SIP content in the Project CANAL proposal; (2) directives to schools for the production of SIPs; (3) a comparison of the criteria for SIP content in the Project CANAL proposal with the directives to the schools; (4) an overview of the project staff; and (5) the criteria used in the substantive audit of the SIPs. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336473

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE OF PROJECT CANAL'S SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS (1989-90)

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

January 1990

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Monitoring Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 025227

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate	Jesse Miller
Maxine Duster	Uthman Muhammad
Mari Fohrman	Donnell Peterson
Carlos Heredia	George Riddick
Gwendolyn Laroche	Aida Sanchez
Henry Martinez	Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Barbara Anglin
Helen Jackson
Barb Leebens-Osilaja
Christy Spears
Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 890-8220

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's

ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE OF PROJECT CANAL'S SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS 1989-90

The primary product of core planning teams for the first year of Project CANAL was to produce a school improvement plan. A school improvement plan, based on an analysis of the school's problems, was to direct actions that would raise levels of academic achievement.

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation analyzed the school improvement plans submitted by core planning teams of the 41 schools participating in Project CANAL. The analysis yielded the following information:

- o No school improvement plan was 100 percent complete. Twenty-six of the 41 plans were judged to be responsive to the administrative directives issued for their completion. But, only seven of 41 were judged to be responsive to the overall philosophy of CANAL.

- o Most school improvement plans displayed an inconsistency or inadequacy between their plan and relevant information and facts about the school and its identified problems.

- o Most of the school improvement plans failed to provide a process for disseminating and obtaining consensus on the plan from the school community.

- o Thirty-four of the 41 school improvement plans contained objectives that could be measured.

- o Although not innovative or unique, over 50 percent of these objectives focused directly on students.

This 64-page progress report was completed under the direction of Dr. Mary E. Davidson, principal investigator, and primary consultant, Dr. Calvin M. Smith, Jr. It has been submitted to the United States Department of Education. A review copy is available at the Monitoring Commission office.

PREFACE

This is the sixth progress report done by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation to satisfy requirements of the $83 million Settlement Fund proposal. This report, written for the United States Department of Education, is an analysis of the level of compliance of the school improvement plans submitted by the schools participating in Project CANAL.

The analysis was done under the direction of myself and the primary consultant, Dr. Calvin M. Smith, Jr. On-site monitoring was conducted by Monitoring Commission staff personnel, Regina Horton, Barb Leebens-Osilaja, Jesse Qualls and Christy R. Spears. Other Commission staff who assisted in this report include Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

January 1990

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION'S

ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE OF PROJECT CANAL'S SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS (1989-90)

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Calvin M. Smith, Jr., Primary Consultant

January 1990

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator,
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION 1

II. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT 3

III. AUDIT PROCEDURES 4

A. The Philosophy of Assessment 4

B. Monitoring Questions for Audit 7

IV. AUDIT FINDINGS 8

A. Phase One 8

B. Phase Two 10

C. Phase Three 16

D. Phase Four 16

E. Phase Five 23

V. CONCLUSION 24

VI. APPENDICES 27

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 DEGREE OF FUNCTIONAL COMPLIANCE. 13

TABLE 2 DEGREE OF SUBSTANTIVE COMPLIANCE 17

TABLE 3 COMPARISON OF THE LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE. 21

APPENDICES

Appendix One:	Listing of DEEOP Project CANAL Proposal References to Expected School Improvement Plan Content	28
Appendix Two:	Project CANAL Staff Directives Given to Schools for the Production of 1989-90 School Improvement Plans	32
Appendix Three:	A Comparison of DEEOP Project CANAL Proposal Criteria and Project CANAL Directives for School Improvement Plan Content.	36
Appendix Four:	The 1988-89 Project CANAL Staff Overview	44
Appendix Five:	A Directory of Monitoring Commission Criteria Employed in the Substantive Audit of 1989-90 Project CANAL School Improvement Plans	61

I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The approved 1988-89 Project CANAL (Creating A New Approach to Learning) proposal contained a great deal of narrative related to the production of school improvement plans by specially trained persons indigenous to each school (core planning teams). Much of the narrative associated with this concept is couched in the tenor of "the plan will contain . . ." or "the plan will provide . . ." Thus, the 1988-89 CANAL proposal set the stage for the development of the school improvement plans, i.e., school improvement plans (SIP) were to be developed by each of the 41 participating schools and certain criteria existed to be applied by CANAL staff to determine the overall quality of each plan.

These SIPs are essential to the success of CANAL efforts. They are the focus of much of the training CANAL has thus far provided to the first-year cohort of participating schools. They are also the construct around which the efforts of each of these schools will be concentrated over the course of the next four school years. Each school's core planning team will need to: 1) manage its resources to achieve the goals of its respective plan; 2) communicate the nature of this management process to its school community; and 3) permit that management process to be guided by the principles of shared decision-making and shared governance. These plans are central to all Project CANAL activities. This concept is the fulcrum against which all decisions by each school core planning team and the CANAL staff are balanced.

If these SIPs are poorly created, there will not be a fixed standard for core planning team guidance and each school community will be poorly served. Ultimately, the students would be victimized by such a condition. This level of importance has been

attached to SIPs. Thus, a corresponding high level of importance is attached to assessing the quality of these plans.

At a point during the first year of CANAL activity the timing for producing SIPs presented itself. CANAL staff determined that each school had a trained core planning team in position to produce the required school improvement plan. CANAL staff subsequently produced and promulgated directives to participating schools to complete and file an SIP by August 1, 1989. Thus, the focus on the production of school improvement plans became clearer. A specific school improvement plan was required of each school by August 1, 1989, and was to be produced according to directives promulgated by CANAL staff (Appendix Two).

Improvement plans were transmitted by each participating school to CANAL staff, although not all were transmitted by the deadline. Twenty-five improvement plans were transmitted by the required August 1, 1989, deadline and subsequently transmitted to the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation (Commission) on August 10, 1989. The remaining 16 improvement plans were transmitted by CANAL staff to the Commission on September 29, 1989.

The Commission holds keen interest in many aspects of the content of these SIPs as well as an interest in the nature of the procedures used to produce these plans. However, the Commission saw its first task with respect to these plans to be a determination of the level of their responsiveness to the standards that exist for their production. Three such determinations needed to be made: 1) the level to which the plans directly respond to the production standards promulgated by CANAL staff; 2) the level to which the plans indirectly respond to the production standards contained in the

1988-89 CANAL proposal; and 3) the level to which the plans reflect high levels of internal consistency.

II. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This document is produced in order that the Commission may meet its Consent Decree responsibility to provide the Chicago community with information regarding the desegregation efforts of the Chicago Public Schools. Project CANAL is based on the Consent Decree's directives that the Chicago Public Schools are to provide programming to raise the achievement levels of minority students attending racially identifiable schools. The Commission's interest in these students has historical precedent. It is, therefore, very much in keeping with the Commission's charge and its mission to closely monitor the activities of CANAL and to report those results to the community.

In addition to the aforementioned Consent Decree responsibility, the Commission is responsible to the United States Department of Justice (Justice) for monitoring the CANAL activities. This responsibility flows directly from the $83 million Settlement Fund. As a funded entity responsible for monitoring the progress of CANAL toward meeting its five-year goals, it is incumbent upon the Commission to report its findings to Justice.

Thus, the purpose of this report is twofold. One is to allow the Commission to fulfill its general responsibility to the Chicago community under the auspices of the Consent Decree. The second is to allow the Commission to meet its specific obligations to the U.S. Department of Justice under the aegis of the conditions of the Settlement Fund.

III. PROCEDURES FOR AUDITING 1989-90 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

A. The Philosophy of Assessment

Five interrelated analysis steps were defined by the Commission in order to determine the level of compliance between the content of school improvement plans and: 1) the CANAL staff directives for production of the improvement plans; 2) the criteria for such plans set forth in the 1988-89 CANAL proposal; 3) the degree of functional compliance; 4) the substantive values of Project CANAL; and 5) the standards of internal consistency. These five audit steps are herein referred to as phases.

Phase One of this audit was a two-pronged process. The production standards for school improvement plans contained in both the 1988-89 CANAL proposal and in the documents promulgated by CANAL staff were isolated for comparison purposes.

This phase was required in order to determine whether or not the instructions that the CANAL staff promulgated for producing school improvement plans both complement and supplement those production criteria set forth in the 1988-89 CANAL proposal. If there were a significant deviation between the standards promulgated by the CANAL staff to participating schools and those contained in the proposal, school improvement plans would likely not be produced in such a fashion that they would contribute to the attainment of CANAL goals. This determination of congruence between the CANAL proposal and CANAL staff standards for producing school improvement plans needed to be made in order to explain any possible lack of completeness of improvement plans.

The process of isolating these standards was accomplished in the following fashion. Independent judges scanned the 1988-89 CANAL proposal and the documents promulgated by the CANAL staff. These judges identified every reference to the production of school improvement plans found in the two documents. After, the judges met and discussed their respective findings. The goal in this instance was to produce a consensus listing of unduplicated standards for producing SIPs from each of the two documents containing standards for same. Recording these listings was the last task performed.

Phase Two of this process involved comparing the two sets of standards obtained in phase one; noting differences.

This phase was, of course, required to determine the number, if any, of deviations from CANAL proposal expectations for school improvement plans made by CANAL staff when they promulgated their production standards to schools for these same plans.

Again, the Commission utilized independent judges to make these determinations. Each judge employed the standards found in the CANAL proposal as well as the standards found in the Overview Document promulgated by the CANAL staff as a test of content in the production of SIPs. Areas were noted where a lack of congruence was determined. After, the judges met and reached a consensus as to the number and nature of each determined deviation. These deviations were recorded for future use in analyzing school improvement plan content.

Phase Three of this audit was designed to determine the degree of functional compliance between the standards for producing school improvement plans that the CANAL staff promulgated and the plans filed by the 41 participating schools.

The procedure for accomplishing this task employed independent readers who read each school improvement plan applying the CANAL staff production directives as the standard. After the readers reached their independent decisions, they met and reached consensus decisions regarding the level of functional compliance achieved by each school improvement plan. The results of this process were recorded for reporting purposes.

Phase Four of this audit involved determining whether or not the content of each school improvement plan was substantively compliant with the standards promulgated by the CANAL staff for plan completion.

This phase was required to determine if the filed school improvement plans contained content that went beyond pro forma compliance with the standards promulgated for the completion of such plans. The question here is not, for example, whether each improvement plan objective is stated in measurable terms; but, whether each objective is stated in such a fashion that it is not only measurable but also stated in such a way that it is substantively related to the CANAL goal under which it is listed.

To accomplish this audit task the Commission developed a set of recognizable standards for accurately determining the substantive relationships among various elements of each school improvement plan. These standards were given to independent readers who applied them to each improvement plan, noted areas of divergence, and met as a group to develop a consensus as to the substantive quality of each school's plan. These consensus judgments were recorded for reporting purposes.

Phase Five required that each school improvement plan be judged for its level of internal consistency.

This phase was needed because each plan could possibly contain a number of narrative strands. Each strand would begin with a statement of a major CANAL goal taken verbatim from the CANAL proposal and proceed through a statement of an objective, a set of activities, action dates, evaluation plans, data collection strategies, etc. The quality of the level of production associated with these various strands should not vary significantly one from another; that quality should remain consistently high.

Determining this level of compliance occurred as a result of the independent judgments made in phase four above.

B. Monitoring Questions for Audit Focus

This audit process will permit the Commission to answer the following major questions with regard to the quality of Project CANAL 1989-90 school improvement plans.

1) How well did the CANAL staff communicate the 1989-90 school improvement plan requirements contained in the CANAL proposal to each of the 41 participating schools?

2) How well did each participating school comply with the letter of the requirements for producing a school improvement plan promulgated by the CANAL staff?

3) How well did each participating school comply with the substance of the CANAL proposal as represented by the nature of CANAL major goals?

4) How well did each participating school produce a high-quality, internally consistent 1989-90 school improvement plan?

5) Will satisfaction of CANAL school improvement plans have long-term impact on children through the use of innovative programming?

IV. AUDIT FINDINGS

A. Phase One Audit

The Project CANAL proposal and the Project CANAL staff Overview Document were reviewed. Major planning criteria for school improvement plans found in the proposal are contained in Appendix One and the consensus listing of major directives contained in the CANAL staff Overview Document are contained in Appendix Two. The CANAL proposal contained 19 discernable criteria and the Overview Document contained 16 primary directives.

B. Phase Two Audit

The procedures outlined earlier were followed by independent readers. Their consensus comparison is contained in Appendix Three. A review of this comparison reveals the following degree of congruence between the CANAL school staff directives for producing a school improvement plan and the CANAL proposal criteria for producing those plans.

Though there was a high level of congruence noted by the reviewers between the CANAL proposal criteria and the Overview directives for producing a school improvement plan, there was not 100% congruence.

The criteria contained in the CANAL proposal that were intended for all schools are, with but two exceptions, covered by the CANAL staff Overview Document. However, where the CANAL proposal spoke to conditions that were to be found in the SIPs of selected subsets of schools (high schools, model cluster schools, Westinghouse High School), the CANAL staff Overview Document is not congruent and contains no directives on these CANAL proposal criteria.

Specifically, the following CANAL criteria for the development of SIPs are not responded to by the CANAL staff Overview directives.

1) The SIP contains required content on waiver needs. Though this proposal criterion was not spoken to by the Overview Document, a subsequent review of individual school improvement plans revealed documented waiver requests from selected schools. The process of generating and documenting waivers may have been made known to these schools by CANAL staff but the Overview Document did not contain any waiver related language.

2) The SIP includes indicators that certain activities or procedures may require waivers. The Commission comment under number one above is also applicable here.

3) High school SIPs contain a mechanism for reporting and receiving student recommendations regarding the implementations of the SIP.
The Commission could find no unique directives in the Overview Document reflecting this CANAL proposal criteria for SIP development.

4) Model cluster school SIPs openly reflect the following objectives:
   a) provide enriched educational programs that will reduce overcrowding by attracting students from overcrowded schools; and
   b) increase achievements in reading and math so they approximate achievements at the national level.
   The Commission could only find a CANAL staff directive regarding the inclusion of criterion "b" above. No evidence of "a" was found in the Overview Document.

5) Model cluster school SIPs reflect the following two content conditions:
   a) The school improvement plans of each cluster school include a detailed description with timelines of the method(s) used to provide an opportunity for Local School Improvement Councils of targeted overcrowded schools to make recommendations on the programs that constitute the plan.
   b) School improvement plans of each cluster school will include strategies for informing parents of the targeted overcrowded schools of their respective programs. The plans also will include strategies for recruiting students to transfer into the cluster schools.
   The Commission could find no unique directives in the Overview Document reflecting this CANAL proposal criterion for SIP development.

6) Westinghouse High School's SIP reflects inclusion of a within school program focused on:
   a) increasing school enrollment;
   b) increasing program completion;

c) lowering dropout rates; and
d) achieving student preparation goal regarding technological employment and/or post secondary training.

The Commission could find no unique directives in the Overview Document reflecting this CANAL proposal criterion for SIP development.

7) The SIP reflects the following parent communication emphases soliciting methods and procedures the school has employed to communicate goals, expectations for students learning, the nature of and the progress being made in school improvement plans, and their perception of being involved in school governance at the local level.

The Commission found directives in the Overview Document relating to parent communication but did not find what it considered to be pointed emphasis on this criterion.

C. Phase Three Audit

Again, the independent reader procedures described earlier by the Commission were employed to determine the degree to which each school functionally compiled with CANAL staff directives in producing its SIP. The directives gleaned from the analysis of the CANAL staff Overview Document were employed as the standards for assessing this degree of congruence of each school's SIP.

The results of this analysis are contained school by school in Table 1. The horizontal headings (1 through 16) correspond to the directives issued by the CANAL staff for producing SIPs that are contained in Appendix Two. The indications contained in Table 1 reveal that none of the 41 schools complied with all Project CANAL staff directives for school improvement plan content. Many did respond to the overwhelming majority of such directives; but, some responded to less than half. All directives considered, the Commission finds that 26 of the submitted SIPs are functionally responsive in that they responded to 80 percent or more Project CANAL staff directives. The remaining 15 SIPs are adjudged non-functional by the Commission because they

contained content that was responsive to less than 80 percent of the CANAL staff directives for SIP development.

These latter 15 plans should have been rejected by CANAL staff as noncompliant and returned to their respective school core planning teams for final completion. There is no evidence that CANAL staff performed this needed action in that all 41 SIPs were forwarded to the Commission for review without CANAL staff comment.

Most perplexing to the Commission are the following specific findings:

1) Ten SIPs contained no statement of the decision-making process used to develop the plan;

2) Twelve SIPs did not contain a section describing how the contents of the plan were reported to core planning team constituencies;

3) Twelve SIPs did not provide information that described how the plan would be sustained once CANAL funds were terminated;

4) Six SIPs contained no budget;

5) Thirteen SIPs did not provide a budget based on the educational objectives set forth in the plan;

6) Nine SIPs did not provide signatures of individuals that were supposed to be representatives of major constituencies and who were directed by the CANAL staff to be involved in the development of the plan;

7) Twenty-four plans did not contain the approval signature of the appropriate district superintendent; and

8) Twenty-six SIPs did not contain survey data from parents or career service staff.

On a more positive note the Commission also determined:

1) Thirty-nine SIPs contained objectives for each of the five major CANAL goals that were supported by data or research and contained evaluative or monitoring designs and reporting schedules;

2) Forty-one SIPs contained activities that were stated in evaluative or measurable terms;

3) Forty SIPs contained objectives projected into 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93;

4) Thirty-one plans, at a minimum, contained a total budget for 1989-90;

5) Thirty-seven SIPs contained a mission statement that communicated the educational priorities of the school, reflected the school's major concerns and objectives, and indicated the primary purpose of the school;

6) Thirty-seven SIPs contained a narrative history of the school;

7) Thirty-seven SIPs contained an information data base section but as indicated above only 15 were complete; and

8) Forty SIPs contained objectives and associated activities that comprised implementation strategies for educational change.

Therefore, the Commission concludes that this phase of 1988-89 CANAL school activity was successfully attained for 26 participating schools; partially attained for four such schools; and not attained for 13 schools. Further, the Commission concludes that no SIP should be funded until the school core planning team functionally complies with all 16 CANAL staff directives for producing a school improvement plan.

There is a range of functional compliance associated with these school improvement plans. Other than a criterion by criterion analysis, the Commission also ascertained the number and percentage of CANAL staff criteria met by each plan. These data are contained in Table 1. These data demonstrated that:

1) 63 percent or 26 of the 41 SIPs were functionally compliant with 80 percent of the CANAL staff criteria for producing same;

2) 32 percent or 13 SIPs were compliant at the 90 percent level and 15 percent or six SIPs were compliant at the 95 percent level;

3) No plan was 100 percent functionally compliant.

4) But, there were nine plans that were less than 60 percent compliant and there were two that functionally complied with less than 25 percent of the CANAL staff directives for producing an SIP.

TABLE 1

THE DEGREE OF FUNCTIONAL COMPLIANCE BETWEEN THE CONTENT OF 1989-90 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR PRODUCING SUCH PLANS

SCHOOL	CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR PRODUCING A 1989-90 SCHOOL IMROVEMENT PLAN																									# OF CRITERIA MET	% OF CRITERIA MET	THE PLAN IS FUNCTIONAL
	1	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	3	4	5	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.4	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
BASS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	24	92.31%	YES
BENNETT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	25	96.15%	YES
BRADWELL	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	0	21	80.77%	YES
BYFORD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	0	X	0	21	80.77%	YES
CARTER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	0	X	22	84.62%	YES
CLARK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X	0	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	21	80.77%	YES
COOPER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	22	84.62%	YES
DEPRIEST	X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	10	38.46%	NO
DETT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	24	92.31%	YES
DUMAS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	24	92.31%	YES
DYETT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	24	92.31%	YES
FERNWOOD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	25	96.15%	YES
FRAZIER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	23	88.46%	YES
GALE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	22	84.62%	YES
GOLDBLATT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	24	92.31%	YES
GREGORY	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	16	61.54%	NO
HAMMOND	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	22	84.62%	YES
HOWE	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	19	73.08%	NO
HUGHES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	25	96.15%	YES
KELYN PARK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	24	92.31%	YES
LAFAYETTE	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	0	17	65.38%	NO
MANIERRE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24	92.31%	YES
MOOS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	24	92.31%	YES
PICCOLO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	21	80.77%	YES
SHERMAN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	X	0	X	X	X	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	14	53.85%	NO
SPENCER	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	23	88.46%	YES
TERRELL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	25	96.15%	YES
WESTINGHOUSE	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	0	0	X	X	X	21	80.77%	YES
WOODSON	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	21	80.77%	YES
DUBOIS	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	53.85%	NO
DUSABLE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	23	88.46%	YES
GUGGENHEIM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	0	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	25	96.15%	YES
HEARST	X	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	X	X	0	X	0	0	0	X	X	X	15	57.69%	NO
JUNGMAN	X	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	X	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	6	23.08%	NO

With less than two-thirds of the 1989-90 SIPs being functionally compliant, the Commission went a step further to determine if there were any distinguishing characteristics associated with those plans adjudged compliant and those not so adjudged. The Commission analyzed the functional compliance of these plans in the following ways: high schools and non-high schools; predominantly black schools and predominantly Hispanic schools; CANAL categories (model cluster school, district laboratory school, and pilot demonstration school); former Chicago Effective Schools (CESP); participating schools and non-participating schools; and schools that filed their SIP by August 1, and those that did not apparently do so.

These comparative data are contained in the following graphic. Save for percentages due solely to small numbers of schools in certain categories, there is only one difference of merit involved in this analysis. Schools that apparently filed their SIP by August 1, 1989, were far more likely to file a functionally compliant plan than those schools that apparently filed their SIP after August 1, 1989. Whether a school was predominantly black or Hispanic, a high school or not, a former CESP school or not, or a CANAL model cluster school, pilot school, or district laboratory school made no difference in the quality of the SIPs filed with the CANAL staff.

Whatever the effects of the CANAL staff directives and training regarding the content and production of a school improvement plan, these effects were not in anyway prone to unduly discourage or encourage any one particular category of schools. This is as it should be.

The only element that one can glean from the data is that just giving a school more time to produce an improvement plan is not likely to increase its quality. If

anything is clear, schools that did not meet the deadline of August 1, 1989, should have received an on-site visit from CANAL staff who in turn scanned the planning work done to date and then constructed a set of procedures that would assist the school in moving toward producing a functionally compliant plan.

The CANAL staff should heed this situation and be prepared to act more proactively toward schools and core planning teams that do not file an improvement plan by the deadline.

A Functional Audit Summary

No school filed a 100 percent functionally compliant SIP and only one CANAL staff directive, "objectives are stated in evaluative or measurable terms," was met by all 41 schools. Even lowering the standard of functionality to satisfying 80 percent of the CANAL staff directives for developing a school improvement plan, produced only a 63 percent compliance rate (26 of 41 schools). But, of most concern to the Commission is the fact that the data in Appendix Two indicates that there are nine plans that functionally complied with less than three of every five directives promulgated by the CANAL staff for the production of an SIP. Among these were two plans that functionally complied with fewer than one of every four such directives.

The Commission focuses on the following questions:

1) What plans did the CANAL staff detail prior to August 1, 1989, to deal with SIPs that would be filed past the due date?

2) What did the CANAL staff perceive to be the level of impact on the potential success of an SIP if any given section or group of sections were missing from a filed SIP or for completed sections that were not satisfactory?

3) What procedures did the CANAL staff have in place prior to August 1, 1989, for returning incomplete SIPs to the participating schools?

4) What procedures were developed after August 1, 1989, when it must have become apparent to the CANAL staff that not all SIPs would be filed on-time and that those filed on-time were either incomplete or unsatisfactorily done in certain required areas?

5) What 1989-90 training procedures does the CANAL staff intend to employ with schools which filed SIPs with missing data?

6) In what way does the CANAL staff intend to justify incomplete or unsatisfactory efforts by CANAL schools to those school communities when the very basis of Project CANAL is to set high educational standards for students, increase parental involvement and encourage more purposeful staff behavior and more focused student behavior? How can these two sets of facts be resolved? How can these schools, the CANAL staff, or DEEOP stand as models of CANAL when efforts such as these occur and are then tacitly approved?

D. Phase Four Audit

Independent readers were utilized to determine the degree to which each SIP was written to substantively comply with the inherent processes of CANAL. This audit was designed to determine if SIPs were written as a coherent whole with a singular focus on the major goals of CANAL as outlined in the 1988-89 DEEOP Project CANAL proposal. After the readers reached their determinations, a consensus was reached as to the substantive status of each of the 41 SIPs. The results of this analysis follow immediately. A listing of the criteria employed by the Commission in this analysis is found in Appendix Five and the results of the analysis are found in Table 2.

The results clearly demonstrate that these 41 school improvement plans leave much to be desired as substantive documents. Seven of these SIPs are clearly substantive. Their content was coherently responsive to the overarching purposes and, indeed, the spirit of CANAL. There were nine partially substantive SIPs filed.

TABLE 2

THE DEGREE OF SUBSTANTIVE COMPLIANCE BETWEEN THE CONTENT OF 1988-89 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND PROPOSAL GOALS

SCHOOL	COMMISSION CRITERIA FOR THE SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF 1988-89 CANAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS																																	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	A'	B'	C'	D'	E'	F'	G'	H'	I'	J'
BARDWELL	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	20123	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	12123	0	*	*	*	*	0	16	59.26%
BASS	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	616	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	0	*	*	*	*	0	16	59.26%
BENNETT	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	14117	0	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	12117	0	*	*	*	*	0	18	66.67%
BYFORD (L)	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11111	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	8111	0	*	*	*	*	0	18	66.67%
CARTER	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	16123	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	14123	5	*	*	*	*	1	22	81.48%
COOPER	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	518	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	518	0	*	*	*	*	1	21	77.78%
DEPRIEST (L)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	015	0	*	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415	0	*	*	*	*	0	5	18.52%
DETT	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	518	0	*	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	618	0	*	*	*	*	0	16	59.26%
DUBOIS (L)	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	14114	1	*	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12114	0	*	*	*	*	0	11	40.74%
DUMAS	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	16120	1	*	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	13120	2	*	*	*	*	0	18	66.67%
DUSABLE (L)	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	9110	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	9110	10	*	*	*	*	1	21	77.78%
FERNWOOD	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	618	0	*	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	118	0	*	*	*	*	0	17	62.96%
GALE	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	5111	1	*	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	9111	0	*	*	*	*	1	21	77.78%
GREGORY (L)	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	418	1	*	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	718	0	*	*	*	*	0	14	51.85%
HEARST (L)	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	516	0	*	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	516	0	*	*	*	*	0	15	55.56%
JUNGMAN (L)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	919	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	619	0	*	*	*	*	0	11	40.74%
KELVYN PARK	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	13126	1	*	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	13126	0	*	*	*	*	0	18	66.67%
LOWELL (L)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	8117	0	*	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10117	0	*	*	*	*	0	7	25.93%
MANIERRE	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	20146	1	*	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	23146	0	*	*	*	*	1	21	77.78%
MOOS	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	11114	1	*	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	7114	0	*	*	*	*	1	21	77.78%
ORR (L)	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	18121	1	*	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12121	0	*	*	*	*	0	14	51.85%
ROBESON (L)	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	18124	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16121	5	*	*	*	*	0	18	66.67%
STOWE (L)	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	316	0	*	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4116	0	*	*	*	*	0	13	48.15%
WILLIAMS (L)	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	10110	0	*	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9110	0	*	*	*	*	0	17	62.96%
LABRATORY SCHOOL TOTAL	8	20	0	18	11	24	20	19	21	2461351	13	4	12	22	21	24	21	17	17	14	15	3	3	3	10	10	13	2201351	22	2	0	3	1	6	*	* 60.03%

LEGEND

(L) = SIP FILED AFTER 8/1/89

* = NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS SIP

1 = REQUIRED INFORMATION IS PRESENT

0 = REQUIRED IN FORMATION IS NOT PRESENT

TABLE 2 (continued)

SCHOOL	COMMISSION CRITERIA FOR THE SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF 1988-89 CANAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS																																				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	A'	B'	C'	D'	E'	F'	G'	H'	I'	J'
CLARK	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	18/23	0	•	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	10123	0	1	•	•	•	1	17	62.96%
FRAZIER	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3115	1	•	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	11115	2	1	•	•	•	0	20	74.07%
HUGHES	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	4118	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8118	0	0	•	•	•	0	14	51.85%
SPENCER	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	8115	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	10115	0	0	•	•	•	1	18	66.67%
SUMNER (L)	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	12112	0	•	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9112	0	0	•	•	•	0	14	51.85%
MODEL CLUSTER TOTAL	2	5	1	4	3	5	5	5	4	45183	3	1	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	2	1	1	3	1	48183	1	2	•	•	•	2	•	• 61.48%
DYETT	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	9110	0	•	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	9110	0	1	•	•	•	0	15	55.56%
GOLDBLATT	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	5110	1	•	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	8110	0	1	•	•	•	1	22	81.48%
GUGGENHEIM (L)	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	4113	1	•	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	13113	0	0	•	•	1	1	16	59.26%
HAMMOND	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	10120	0	•	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	10120	0	0	•	•	•	0	17	62.96%
HOWE	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	71113	0	•	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	91113	0	0	•	•	•	0	12	44.44%
LAFAYETTE	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	519	0	•	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	0	0	•	•	•	0	13	48.15%
MAYO (L)	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	11112	0	•	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8112	0	0	•	•	•	0	12	44.44%
PICCOLO	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	10112	1	•	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	10112	0	0	•	•	•	0	13	48.15%
SHERMAN (L)	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	616	1	•	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	416	0	0	•	•	•	0	14	51.85%
TERRELL	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	13114	0	•	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	13114	0	0	•	•	•	0	19	70.37%
WESTINGHOUSE	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	516	0	•	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	516	0	0	•	0	•	0	15	55.56%
WOODSON NORTH	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	616	0	•	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	616	0	0	•	•	•	1	18	66.67%
PILOT SCHOOL TOTAL	5	11	1	10	4	12	10	10	12	911131	4	•	4	10	6	12	11	6	10	9	10	0	0	1	5	6	6	971131	0	2	•	0	1	3	•	• 47.22%
TOTAL FOR ALL SCHOOLS	15	36	2	32	18	41	35	34	37	382 of 565	34	•	18	36	30	40	37	25	35	22	35	4	6	2	16	19	20	365 of 565	23	6	0	3	2	11	•	•

LEGEND

(L) = SIP FILED AFTER 8/1/89
• = NOT APPLICABLE TO THIS SIP
1 = REQUIRED INFORMATION IS PRESENT
0 = REQUIRED IN FORMATION IS NOT PRESENT

Therefore, the remaining 25 SIPs failed to incorporate the key concepts of CANAL into each section of their improvement plan.

The specific results of this audit are as follows:

1) Twenty-six SIPs had no narrative history that linked the historical changes in a school community with the current status of the school;

2) Thirty-nine SIPs did not focus the Mission Section on the ultimate accomplishments of CANAL.

3) Twenty-three SIPs did not contain school-wide data arrays in their Information Base Data sections that complemented their educational priorities;

4) Twenty-three SIPs contained monitoring plans that would yield data susceptible to multiple interpretations;

5) Sixteen SIPs contained evaluations of implementation strategies that would not permit an unequivocal determination of attainment of objectives;

6) Fifteen SIPs requested resources not necessary to implement the plan;

7) Nineteen SIPs contained a budget that was too heavily tilted toward the acquisition of resources that would not outlast CANAL funding;

8) Thirty-nine SIPs did not contain a Reporting Section that indicated that the core planning team of each school knew its role needed to be continuously monitored to ensure that its presence remained as vital as need be;

9) Twenty-two SIPs contained a budget that was too heavily committed to the acquisition of new employees, and 21 SIPs did not contain a plan for dealing with the inevitable termination of CANAL funds; and

10) The forty-one filed SIPs contained 565 objectives, only 27 could be considered truly innovative in nature.

There were positive aspects to these plans.

1) All 41 SIPs contained a preponderance of objectives that, if met, would significantly contribute to attaining CANAL goals;

2) Thirty-five SIPs contained objectives that could be reasonably attained without undue effort;

3) Thirty-four SIPs contained objectives based on data found in the Information Base Data Section of the plan;

4) All 39 SIPs had 100 percent of their objectives focused on a legitimate CANAL target population;

5) Thirty-four SIPs contained 100 percent quantifiable objectives;

6) Thirty-six SIPs contained monitoring designs that would yield sufficient data to determine the progress of a plan toward meeting its objectives;

7) In 40 SIPs, if all activities were fulfilled, relevant objectives would be met;

8) In 37 SIPs, activities would contribute effects to monitoring plans in time to be measured;

9) In 35 SIPs, valid correlations were made between objectives and State of Illinois mandates;

10) Thirty-nine SIPs contained a large number of objectives focused on students;

11) Two of five model cluster schools filed SIPs that reflected the fact that their program was to motivate voluntary student transfers from nearby over utilized schools;

12) Three of 12 district laboratory schools filed SIPs that reflected their prior participation in a Secretary of Education discretionary program; and

13) Guggenheim school's SIP reflected its prior experience with a specialized economics educational/marketing program. But Westinghouse High School's SIP did not reflect any of the specialized objectives that prompted its inclusion in the DEEOP Project CANAL proposal.

Only 17.1 percent (seven) of the 41 SIPs were judged to be substantively compliant with the tone and tenor of the CANAL proposal. Only an additional 22 percent (nine) were somewhat substantively compliant.

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF THE LEVELS OF COMPLIANCE OF 1989-90 CANAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

SCHOOL	COMPLIANCE STATUS	
	FUNCTIONAL	SUBSTANTIVE
BASS	YES	NO
BENNETT	YES	NO
BRADWELL	YES	NO
BYFORD	YES	NO
CARTER	YES	YES
CLARK	YES	NO
COOPER	YES	YES
DEPRIEST	NO	NO
DETT	YES	NO
DUBOIS	NO	NO
DUMAS	YES	NO
DUSABLE	YES	YES
DYETT	YES	NO
FERNWOOD	YES	NO
FRAZIER	YES	NO
GALE	YES	YES
GOLDBLATT	YES	YES
GREGORY	NO	NO
GUGGENHEIM	YES	NO
HAMMOND	YES	NO
HEARST	NO	NO
HOWE	NO	NO
HUGHES	YES	NO
JUNGMAN	NO	NO
KELYN PARK	YES	NO
LAFAYETTE	NO	NO
LOWELL	NO	NO
MANIERRE	YES	YES
MAYO	NO	NO
MOOS	YES	YES
ORR	NO	NO
PICCOLO	YES	NO
ROBESON	NO	NO
SHERMAN	NO	NO
SPENCER	YES	NO
STOWE	NO	NO
SUMNER	NO	NO
TERRELL	YES	NO
WESTINGHOUSE	YES	NO
WILLIAMS	NO	NO
WOODSON	YES	NO

The Commission had intended to perform the same secondary analysis here as it did with its functional compliance analysis. But, with only nine SIPs being substantively compliant, the number is just too small to reveal any clear-cut results. To analyze whether the core planning teams of predominantly black schools performed better than those of predominantly Hispanic schools or whether high schools did better than elementary schools, or former Chicago Effective Schools participants were better performers than those that were not, would be fallacious.

A Substantive Audit Summary

No school filed a 100 percent substantively compliant SIP and only one met the Commission substantive criterion, "attainment of the SIP objectives will significantly satisfy the purpose of CANAL that are embedded within the goal statements provided by the CANAL staff." In addition, 40 SIPs also met the Commission's substantive criterion, "if fully implemented, the SIP implementation activities will permit attainment of the relevant objectives included in the SIP." With only a 17.1 percent substantive compliance rate, the Commission is concerned whether or not the underlying scope and sequence of the CANAL philosophy, as expressed in the 1988-89 proposal, will last even to the end of the project, let alone beyond. There are goals and objectives, objectives that are relevant and attainable and quantifiable, there are valid, focused educational activities and timelines. But, these SIPs do not seem to contain an expressed sense of the need to meld the school and the community into one unit. There does not appear to be a sufficient awareness of the fact that core planning teams represent

constituencies and that the nature of this representativeness requires establishing, maintaining and monitoring feedback loops. These communication loops are needed to ensure that school constituencies are able to stay informed about the educational goals of the school and to ensure that constituents have a vehicle for offering informed assistance to the attainment of these goals. This condition cannot be allowed to exist or CANAL will be short-lived in these 41 participating schools.

The Commission asks but one most central question. What procedures, processes, and constituent participation will the CANAL staff initiate in 1989-90 to give a second opportunity to core planning team members to acquire a pervasive sense of the philosophy of CANAL and not just a sense of its practices?

E. Phase Five Audit

This audit of internal consistency proved very difficult to accomplish as the various school improvement plans contained 565 separate statements of objectives, each with its own strand of activities, monitoring schedules, and overall timelines. This was many more objective strands than was anticipated by the Commission audit process. Again, the Commission believed that the quality of the strands should not vary significantly, one from another, across the forty-one SIPs and most especially within each SIP.

Forty-one plans were filed with the CANAL staff. Each contained an Implementation Strategy Section and, in total, there were 565 separate objectives contained therein. The Commission audit revealed that 31 of these plans were highly consistent and that 21 of these met a high to relatively high standard.

V. CONCLUSION

The Commission stated earlier that there were five questions it sought to answer with this audit of CANAL 1989-90 school improvement plans. These questions are answered herein below.

Question One: How well did the CANAL staff communicate the 1989-90 school improvement plan requirements contained in the CANAL proposal to each of the 41 participating schools?

General requirements were well communicated to schools with the exception of the need to request waivers of standard codified practices, accompanied by appropriate documentation. Also, specific requirements that the proposal set forth for high schools, model cluster schools, district laboratory schools, and Guggenheim and Westinghouse schools were not covered by CANAL staff directives for producing 1989-90 school improvement plans.

Question Two: How well did each participating school comply with the letter of the requirements for producing a school improvement plan that were promulgated by CANAL staff?

Schools responded well enough to the CANAL staff Overview Document. Fifteen schools filed SIPs that were not functionally compliant with CANAL staff standards. But, 26 were functionally compliant. However, even in the case of being adjudged fully compliant, no SIP functionally complied with all 26 CANAL staff directives for school improvement content.

Question Three: How well did each participating school comply with the substance of the CANAL proposal as represented by the nature of CANAL goals?

The school improvement plans' substantive responses were not good. Nine schools filed improvement plans that were adjudged substantively responsive. Major shortcomings of the remaining 32 SIPs centered on a level of thoughtful consideration of the full impact of CANAL on a school's history, its mission, and its educational priorities. There was also a general weakness in the core planning team's ability to forecast its role as a communicator with those constituencies in the school community that its members represented. The Commission perceives this lack of substantive compliance to be a serious long-range problem for Project CANAL.

Question Four: How well did each participating school produce a high-quality 1989-90 school improvement plan?

Although 21 plans produced internally consistent Implementation Strategy sections of high to relatively high quality, 20 were filed with the CANAL staff that contained less than expected evidence of internal consistency. In too many instances, objectives were not readily measurable or were so sketchy in their construction, that no judgement as to their overall merit could be made. In many plans, these objectives were a part of an overall concept that also contained many, even a majority, of other objective strands of very high quality, representing a high level of cohesiveness from the goal statement through the objective and activities to a monitoring plan and timetable for implementation. This lack of consistency is a second serious concern to the Commission, in that it may portend half-hearted efforts by some schools toward meeting certain CANAL goals.

Question Five: Will satisfaction of CANAL school improvement plans have a long-term impact on children through the use of innovative programming?

If the 565 objectives contained in these 41 CANAL school improvement plans are fulfilled, students will profit a great deal, as more than 50 percent of these objectives focus directly on them. However, the programming they will receive will not be innovative or even somewhat unique. They will be the recipients of almost classical school responses to student concerns and problems: remediation, small group interaction, counseling; and, from time to time, team teaching or teaching team instruction or peer assisted learning.

Perhaps the Commission expected too much. Regardless of the training the core planning teams received, there is only so much perspective they can bring to this endeavor. The fact that so many schools did so much is testimony to a strong will to change, to try to improve, and to push ahead in the face of great, long-standing difficulties. The Commission sees that a large responsibility now lies with DEEOP and the CANAL staff. The SIPs are in their hands. They must develop strategies to assist schools in refining and improving these plans. Moreover, they must develop the process and procedures that will nourish these early school efforts, so that they will not atrophy before they ever get a chance to be truly attempted. DEEOP and CANAL staff must take on this new supportive role very quickly and most energetically.

This analysis demonstrates that, as a group, the 41 school improvement plans submitted by the participating CANAL schools are neither functionally nor substantively compliant.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

A LISTING OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL REFERENCES TO EXPECTED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

A LISTING OF DEEOP CANAL PROPOSAL REFERENCES TO EXPECTED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Proposal Criteria (reference)

1. Plan is designed to meet the specific educational needs of students (p. 2).

2. Core Planning Team (CPT) members serve as two-way communicators for the groups they represent regarding school improvement plan (SIP) phases (p. 3).

3. Plan includes correlates of Effective Schools Research (p. 3).

4. Plan encompasses the following CANAL concepts (p. 11).

    - o Creating educational environments in schools that foster teaching and learning;
    - o Implementing personnel and parent training programs that improve management and instructional systems;
    - o Developing a school-based management system base demonstrating strong leadership by the principal and cooperative decision-making by relevant constituencies;
    - o Implementing student, parent, teacher, and administrator training programs that will enable constituencies to engage in shared governance at the local school level.

5. Plan exhibits district superintendent concurrence (p. 20).

6. Plan exhibits evidence of district superintendent and project director assistance and\or provision of information.

7. Plan contains content that enables the utilization of the following evaluation criteria (pp. 20-21).

    a. A description of how staff, parents, and students will be involved in decision making.

    b. A detailed plan for increasing student achievement will encompass:

        - o instructional programs rationale for selection and substantive data;
        - o organizational structure rationale for decision and substantive data;

- o staff development;
- o school climate;
- o assessment of student progress;
- o student achievement goals for each year of project;
- o staff evaluation procedures;
- o parent involvement; and
- o budget allocations

c. The plan will contain specific objectives with detailed related activities that clearly indicate how each objective will be met. Each objective will be stated in measurable terms and will contain strategies to evaluate success.

d. The plan will contain an overall formative evaluation strategy to be utilized on a continuous basis to determine program effectiveness at the local school site. Evaluation strategies will be developed in consultation with staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation.

e. Budget allocations should be made with a view toward ensuring that the goals of the program will be incorporated into the ongoing life of the school and its classrooms once the project ends. Priority consideration will be given to School Improvement Plans that propose developing instructional programs and services that can be sustained or expanded through staff development, rather than purchases of staff that cannot be continued.

f. The plan will indicate how the program will be sustained after the fifth year when funding ceases.

8. Plan content demonstrates a needs-based instructional focus with potential for improving student achievement (p. 21).

9. Plan contains required content on waiver needs (p. 21).

10. Plan includes indicators that certain activities or procedures may require waivers (p. 22).

11. High school plans contain a mechanism for reporting and receiving student recommendations regarding the implementation of the SIP (pp. 23-24).

12. Model cluster school plans that openly reflect the following objectives (p.26).

a. provide enriched educational programs that will reduce overcrowding by attracting students from overcrowded schools.

b. increase achievements in reading and math so they approximate achievements at the national level.

13. Model cluster school plans reflect the following two content conditions (p. 27):

- o The school improvement plans of each cluster school will include a detailed description with timelines of the method(s) used to provide an opportunity for Local School Improvement Councils of targeted overcrowded schools to make recommendations on the programs that constitute the plan.

- o School improvement plans developed by the cluster schools will include strategies for informing parents of the targeted overcrowded schools of their respective programs. The plans will also include strategies for recruiting students to transfer into the cluster schools.

14. Westinghouse High School's improvement plan reflects inclusion of a within school program focused on (p. 29):

a. increasing student enrollment;

b. increasing program completion;

c. lowering dropout rates; and

d. achieving student preparation goal regarding technological employment and/or post-secondary training.

15. Plan reflects identified needs for improving school appearance and climate (p. 45).

16. Each participating school files an approved SIP by the final deadline (p. 57).

17. Plan reflects evidence that the following were represented in the production of the plan (p. 57): engineers, lunchroom managers, teacher aides, school aides, clerks, teachers, parents and where appropriate, students.

18. Plan includes a process for reporting results of implementation to the project director (p. 57).

19. Plan reflects the following parent communication emphases (p. 71):

> soliciting methods and procedures the school has employed to communicate goals, expectations for students learning, the nature of and the progress being made in school improvement plans, and their perception of being involved in school governance at the local level.

APPENDIX TWO

PROJECT CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES GIVEN TO SCHOOLS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF 1989-90 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

PROJECT CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES GIVEN TO SCHOOLS FOR THE PRODUCTION OF 1988-89 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Overview Directives (reference)

1.0 The plan is formulated by the core planning team and other members of the school community (p. 1).

2.0 The plan is to include content reflective of the following (p. 1):

- 2.1 Narrative history of the school;
- 2.2 A statement of the mission of the school;
- 2.3 A planning information base;
- 2.4 CANAL goal implementation strategies;
- 2.5 A description of the core planning team decision making process;
- 2.6 A description of the processes to be used in reporting the plan;
- 2.7 A description of the process for sustaining the plan beyond year five; and
- 2.8 A budget

3.0 The narrative history section provides a background setting and description of the school and community (p. 1).

4.0 The mission statement section communicates the educational priorities of the school to the entire community; reflects the school's major concerns and objectives; and indicates the primary purpose of the school (p. 2).

5.0 The information base section of the plan includes opinion survey results, school-wide data arrays, and system-wide data focussed on the following seven factors: shared decision making, school, climate, instructional program, student achievement, parent involvement, and resource utilization (p. 2).

6.0 The information base section is directed to include the following:

- 6.1 The results of the Effective Schools Battery for students and teachers (p. 2).

6.2 The results of REP developed surveys of parents and career service staff (p. 2).

6.3 Local school documentation forms containing local school data arrays (p. 3).

6.4 District-wide test scores in reading and math for grades 3, 6, and 8 (p. 3).

7.0 The implementation section contains objectives for each of five CANAL proposal goals and are accompanied by monitoring and evaluation plans; cites supporting evidence from the information data base of from published research that substantiates objectives and activities; includes monitoring and evaluation activities and schedules; indicates procedures for reporting results to CANAL administration; and indicates congruence with the state of Illinois reform goals (pp. 4-5).

8.0 Objectives are stated in evaluative or measurable terms (p. 6).

9.0 Objectives are projected for school years 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93 (p. 6).

10.0 Budget requests are directly correlated to objectives (p. 6).

11.0 The decision-making process section contains procedures used for attaining shared decision-making that engages teachers, parents, career services staff, community representatives, and students in: planning, data collection, data analysis, problem-solving, and decision making. This section to also contain:

- o a description of the persons involved in the development of the school improvement plan
- o a description of techniques used to arrive at reflected decisions
- o a description of methods used to disseminate the plan to all constituents (p. 7).

12.0 The reporting procedures section contains a description of how the school will report progress to the CANAL administration (p. 7).

13.0 The plan includes descriptions of processes, training, constituency development, and other strategies for sustaining the plan beyond the termination of CANAL funding; a plan that reflects non-reliance on the external support (pp. 7-8).

14.0 The plan includes a total budget (p. 8).

15.0 The plan contains the signatures of persons representing the various constituencies involved in its development (Handout Form).

16.0 The plan contains the approval signature of the school's district superintendent (Handout Form).

APPENDIX THREE

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND PROJECT CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
1. Plan is designed to meet the specific educational needs of students (p. 2)	1. The entire school improvement plan Overview Document speaks directly to this criterion.
2. Core Planning Team (CPT) members serve as two-way communicators for the groups they represent regarding school improvement plan (SIP) phases (p. 3).	2. The overview's Decision-making Process Section, paragraph 3, page 7: This section of the school improvement plan includes a description of the persons involved in developing this plan, techniques used for arriving at the decisions reflected by the plan and methods used to disseminate the plan to all constituents.
3. Plan includes correlates of Effective Schools Research (p. 3).	3. The Information Base Data Section of the overview references this criterion.
4. Plan encompasses the following CANAL concepts (p. 11). o Creating educational environments in schools that foster teaching and learning; o Implementing personnel and parent training programs that improve management and instructional systems; o Developing a school-based management system base demonstrating strong leadership by the principal and cooperative decision-making by relevant constituencies; o Implementing student, parent, teacher, and administrator training programs that will	4. The Implementation Strategies Section of the overview references CANAL goals that are pre-printed on the SIP required Form 1's. These goals reflect criterion four.

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
enable constituencies to engage in shared governance at the local school level.	
5. Plan exhibits district superintendent concurrence (p. 20).	5. The school improvement plan signatory page requires the approval signature of the appropriate district superintendent.
6. Plan exhibits evidence of district superintendent and project director assistance and/or provision of information.	6. Though the entire overview document is evidence of an attempt to provide project assistance to the school and though there are several references to aid that central office units may provide, there is no direct reference to assistance that could be provided by the district superintendent or project director.
7. Plan contains content that enables the utilization of the following evaluative criteria (pp. 20-21).	7. The overview's Decision-making Process Section on page seven speaks directly to criterion 7a.
a. A description of how staff, parents, and students will be involved in decision making.	
b. A detailed plan for increasing student achievement will encompass: o instructional programs - rationale for selection and substantive data; o organizational structure - rationale for decision and substantive data; o staff development; o school climate; o assessment of student progress;	Criterion 7b is directly addressed by the overview's Implementation Strategies Section and the section on Budget. It is also addressed by the format of the various required planning forms.

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
o student achievement goals for each year of project; o staff evaluation procedures; o parent involvement; and o budget allocations.	
c. The plan will contain specific objectives with detailed related activities that clearly indicate how each objective will be met. Each objective will be stated in measurable terms and will contain strategies to evaluate success.	Criterion 7c is met by the overview section on the proper completion of the required planning Form 1.
d. The plan will contain an overall formative evaluation strategy to be utilized on a continuous basis to determine program effectiveness at the local school site. Evaluation strategies will be developed in consultation with staff from the Department of Research and Evaluation.	Criterion 7d is met by the overview section on the proper completion of required planning Form 1 by the requested content for required planning Form 2/2a and by the overview section on Reporting Procedures on page 7.
e. Budget allocations should be made with a view toward ensuring that the goals of the program will be incorporated into the ongoing life of the school and its classrooms once the project ends. Priority consideration will be given to School Improvement Plans that propose developing instructional programs and services that can be sustained or expanded through staff development,	Criteria 7e and 7f are met by the overview section Process for Sustaining Plan Beyond Year Five, pages 7 and 8.

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
rather than purchases of staff that cannot be continued.	
f. The plan will indicate how the program will be sustained after the fifth year when funding ceases.	
8. Plan content demonstrates a needs based instructional focus with potential for improving student achievement (p. 21).	8. The overview's Information Base Data Section on pages 2 and 3 satisfies this criterion.
9. Plan contains required content on waiver needs (p. 21).	9. Not covered by the overview document or planning forms.
10. Plan includes indicators that certain activities or procedures may require waivers (p. 22).	10. Not covered by the overview document or planning forms.
11. High school plans contain a mechanism for reporting and receiving student recommendations regarding the implementation of the SIP (pp. 23,24).	11. High schools are not singled out in the Overview document. All schools are directed to cover this topic by the content of the Decision-making Process Section of the overview.

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
12. Model cluster school plans that openly reflect the following objectives (p. 26): - provide enriched educational programs that will reduce overcrowding by attracting students from overcrowded schools. - increase achievements in reading and math so they approximate achievements at the national level.	12. Model Cluster Schools are singled out by the overview documents and this criterion, but is not met by that document or the required planning forms.
13. Model cluster school plans reflect the following two content conditions (p. 27): The school improvement plans of each cluster school will include a detailed description with timelines of the method(s) used to provide an opportunity for Local School Improvement Councils of targeted overcrowded schools to make recommendations on the programs that constitute the plan. School improvement plans developed by the cluster schools will include strategies for informing parents of the targeted overcrowded schools of their respective programs. The plans will also include strategies for recruiting students to transfer into the cluster schools.	13. Model cluster schools are singled out by the overview document and this criterion is not met by the document or the required planning forms.

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
14. Westinghouse High School's improvement plan reflects inclusion of a within school program focused on (p. 29): a) increasing student enrollment; b) increasing program completion; c) lowering dropout rates; and d) achieving student preparation goal regarding technological employment and/or post-secondary training.	14. Westinghouse High School is not singled out by the overview document and this criterion is not met by that document or the required planning forms.
15. Plan reflects identified needs for improving school appearance and climate (p. 45).	15. This criterion is satisfied by the Information Base Data Section on page 2 of the overview document and by the requirement of planning Form 1.
16. Each participating school files an approved SIP by the final deadline (p. 57).	16. The cover memorandum of the overview document requires each CANAL principal to submit in a plan by August 1, 1989.
17. Plan reflects evidence that the following were represented in the production of the plan (p. 57): engineers, lunchroom managers, teacher aides, school aides, clerks, teachers, parents and where appropriate, students.	17. The required signatory page of the plan as well as the Decision-making Process Section on page 7 of the overview document satisfy this criterion.

A COMPARISON OF DEEOP PROJECT CANAL PROPOSAL CRITERIA AND CANAL STAFF DIRECTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN CONTENT

Project CANAL Criteria (reference)	DEEOP School Improvement Plan Directives (reference)
18. Plan includes a process for reporting results of implementation to the project director (p. 57).	18. The Reporting Procedures Section on page 7 of the overview document satisfies this criterion.
19. Plan reflects the following parent communication emphases (p. 71): soliciting methods and procedures the school has employed to communicate goals, expectations for students learning, the nature of and the progress being made in school improvement plans, and their perception of being involved in school governance at the local school.	19. The overview generally alludes to this criterion but does not offer anything specific.

APPENDIX FOUR

THE 1988-89 PROJECT CANAL STAFF OVERVIEW DOCUMENT

Chicago Public Schools
Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs

PROJECT CANAL
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN OVERVIEW

The Project CANAL School Improvement Plan is the culmination of a year-long process of consensus building, school based management/shared decision making training, information gathering, and team planning. The Plan is formulated by the Core Planning Team and other members of the school community. It displays how the school's vision is translated into concrete procedures, programs, and personnel that will result in educational improvement.

The Plan will follow the outline described in this overview and will be included in the Project CANAL School Improvement Plan notebook. The notebook is divided into these sections:

Narrative History of School
Mission Statement
Information Base Data
Implementation Strategies
Decision Making Process
Reporting Procedures
Process for Sustaining Plan Beyond Year 5
Budget

A discussion of each of these sections follows.

NARRATIVE HISTORY OF SCHOOL

This section of the Plan provides the background setting and description of the school and community. You might include information about the founding of the school, the first building, the current building, the surrounding community and its resources, information about the person or area the school is named for, notable graduates or former staff members, the school motto, crest, slogan, and song, and other pertinent data.

In addition to the information found at the school, other sources include the High School Directory published by the Board of Education in 1987 that provides a succinct history of each high school. The Bureau of Management Information (890-7712) maintains a folder for all schools containing Board reports and news clippings that may be useful. Also, the Bureau of Libraries (890-8990) has several resource books about Chicago school history.

MISSION STATEMENT

The school mission statement is a documented means to communicate the educational priorities of the school to the entire school community. As an outgrowth of the vision of excellence created by the school community, the mission statement reflects the schools' major concerns and objectives. The mission statement indicates that the primary purpose of the school is to promote student learning outcomes.

INFORMATION BASE DATA

The Project CANAL Information Base for developing the School Improvement Plan has been conceived as a multi-dimensional process focused on seven factors (shared decision-making, school climate, instructional program, student achievement, parent involvement, and resource utilization). The information has been collected through the following:

. Opinion Surveys - completed by the appropriate school groups (teachers/students/parents/ and career service).

. Schoolwide data - evaluation staff have developed procedures and forms to enable the core planning team to document information about the school not known through other sources.

. Systemwide data - DEEOP and evaluation staff have identified sources of information compiled by the Central Office in order to expand "School Profiles."

Opinion Surveys

The Effective School Battery (ESB), published by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., was administered to teachers and students. In addition, evaluation staff developed opinion surveys for other audiences, including parents, and career service. The results of these surveys (which will be available in early summer 1989) are to be included in this information base.

Schoolwide Data

Since the local school staff and community are most familiar with the day-to-day operations of the school, they are the appropriate source for this information. Evaluation staff provided means for documenting supplemental programs and other schoolwide data. The Local School Documentation form and other

forms should be included in this section of the School Improvement Plan.

Other important variables include:

Teacher grades
Time allocated by subject area
Time on task by subject area
Amount of student recreational reading
Amount of out-of-school reading
Library use
Extracurricular activities
Participation in academic events (Olympics, Science Fair, History Fair, Junior Great Books, Young Authors, Spelling Bee, etc.)
Teacher awards
Teacher interests

Systemwide Data

Achievement test data that is available systemwide should also be included. These may include results from the following tests:

Elementary	High Schools
ITBS	TAP
CRTs	STEP
IGAP	ACT
MSPT	DRP
Illinois Con Test	MSPT

Schools should include a copy of the three charts showing test score data for the third, sixth, and eighth grade students in stacked bar graph format. These graphs show the percentage of students who scored in each of the four national quartiles for the Illinois Goal Assessment in Reading, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills in Reading Comprehension and Mathematics Total. The graphs were distributed to principals in January 1989.

Other variables that may be useful include:

Retention/Promotion rates
Students Passing Courses
Courses Passed
Dropout rate
Graduation rate
Student attendance
Teacher attendance

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

This section of the School Improvement Plan contains implementation strategies, including Project CANAL goals, objectives, activities, monitoring and evaluation strategies, and budgets for new Project CANAL programs. Multiple copies of the forms discussed below are included in the School Improvement Plan notebook.

FORM 1

This form contains a restatement of five school-based Project CANAL goals as stated in the Settlement Fund Proposal. You will use Form 1 to state your objectives for 1989-90 and describe your plans for monitoring and evaluating each objective. You will probably write several objectives for each Project CANAL goal.

Project CANAL Goals

Project CANAL Goal: Improve the performance of underachieving students by improving the quality of instruction through carefully designed staff training experience.

> Comments: This is Sub-Goal #1 in the proposal on pages 35, 39, and 43. Objective #3 contains activities, including evaluation strategies, that may be useful for your school improvement plan.

Project CANAL Goal: Raise the performance of underachieving students by creating and maintaining a positive educational climate that fosters teaching and learning among students.

> Comments: Sub-Goal #2 contains four objectives (pages 45, 47, 49, and 51) with enabling activities and evaluation strategies that may be helpful for your plan.

Project CANAL Goal: Improve student achievement by developing school-based management, shared governance, and cooperative decision-making.

> Comments: See Sub-Goal #3 (page 54 and 57) for activities and evaluation.

Project CANAL Goal: Create an academically oriented perspective of school among students by increasing their participation in academic activities.

Comments: Page 59 of the Project CANAL proposal contains activities and evaluation suggestions for this goal.

Project CANAL Goal: Increase student achievement.

Comments: This is the major, overall goal for Project CANAL.

Rationale or information base

Cite evidence from your information base (previous section) to provide a rationale for each objective. This can include scores, survey results, local school documentation, or other evidence about your school. You may also cite published research to substantiate your objectives and activities.

Describe monitoring and evaluation plan

Briefly indicate how you will check progress on achieving your desired objective. Monitoring activities usually include checking on implementation progress, while evaluation focuses on program effectiveness. The plan may be very simple ("analyze student report card grades quarterly") or more complex and frequent ("interview a sample of teachers, students, and parents monthly"). (See handout from Research and Evaluation listing possible evaluation criteria.)

Schedule monitoring activities

Provide the dates when you will make formal checks of the progress toward your objective and specify what you will be checking.

Indicate results of monitoring activity

Complete this portion of Form 1 during implementation in 1989-90. This is intended to be a management tool for tracking progress and for reporting to the Project CANAL administration.

Check the state goals to which this CANAL goal is related

This section paraphrases the major Illinois goals from Senate Bill 1840. Check off those that apply.

FORM 2

Form 2 contains details of the activities for each objective.

1989-90 Objective

Repeat the objective from Form 1.

Evaluation of Objective

State the objective in terms that can be evaluated or measured.

Program and evaluation activity/strategy description

This section is similar to Action Plans used previously in the Chicago Public Schools. The activity section on the left should include evaluation activities planned for throughout the year. The right hand column is for progress notes to be kept during implementation.

FORM 2/2a Continued

This optional form provides additional space for continuing activities and strategies from Form 2.

FORM 3

Use Form 3 to project objectives for 1990-91, 1991-92 and 1992-93. Repeat the 1989-90 objective from Form 1 and Form 2.

FORM 1a

Form 1a is provided for objectives that apply to other goals. Complete this form as you would complete Form 1.

FORM 4

This budget sheet should be completed each time an objective requires special funding (for either staff or other expenditures) to be paid for with Project CANAL funds. (The budget sheets will be summarized in a Total Budget section at the end of the plan.) Please note that you must provide program codes for each budget line. These codes are available in a table that lists all program codes and their descriptions. (The budget office prepares this report, number FI926, called Budget Classification Description.)

Please be certain that the budget requests are directly correlated to the objectives. There should be no question about how the expenditure will help to achieve the objective.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The Project CANAL goal of increased student achievement is facilitated by the development of a school improvement plan that encompasses cooperative decision-making by relevant constituencies under the leadership of the principal. Included in this section of the school improvement plan are procedures used for shared decision-making that engage teachers, career service staff, parents, community representatives and students in planning, data collection, data analysis, problem-solving, and making decisions.

Consensus building, team building, pyramiding, problem-solving, conflict resolution, brainstorming, trust building, group process, facilitation, and empowering of others are skills used to ensure the integrity of the process and the full participation of the constituencies. Giving school constituencies increased responsibility for sharing decisions fosters the collegial exchange of ideas necessary for effective professional practice and enhancement of the learning environment.

This section of the school improvement plan includes a description of the persons involved in developing this plan, techniques used for arriving at the decisions reflected by the plan and methods used to disseminate the plan to all constituents.

REPORTING PROCEDURES

This section should describe how the school will report to the Project CANAL staff on its progress toward meeting its goals and objectives. Two reports (January 31 and June 30) will be required. The majority of the information for these reports will be available from the school-based monitoring and evaluation activities as listed in the previous section of the School Improvement Plan on implementation strategies. Form 1 contains your monitoring and evaluation plan as well as the results of the monitoring and evaluation activities. Your progress notes on Form 2 will also be part of the semester reports.

PROCESS FOR SUSTAINING PLAN BEYOND YEAR 5

In this section of the Plan, include processes, training, constituency involvement, and other strategies that will describe how initiatives will be sustained after the fifth

year of the project. It is possible that you will not have resources to continue components of your Plan if you do not develop procedures for sustaining them beyond the fifth year now.

New programs that are created by new funds and depend on extra finances will not be maintained when the funds are exhausted. However, if new funds are used to revitalize teachers and staff, develop new techniques for management, and create a base of support in the community, then the value of the funds can remain in the school long after the funds have been spent.

BUDGET

Provide one Total Budget for Project CANAL funds. Be sure that Grand Total on this Budget is equal to the sum of all the separate budget worksheets. The total budget sheet has no space for program codes since it is likely that each total line will be composed of several different programs.

Chicago Public Schools — PROJECT CANAL — Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs

Form 1 — SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN — Page ____

Project CANAL Goal: Raise the performance of underachieving students by creating and maintaining a positive educational climate that fosters teaching and learning among students. Curriculum area _____

1989-90 Objective: _____

Rationale or information base: _____

Describe monitoring and evaluation plan: _____

Schedule monitoring activities:

Date 1 _____ Activity _____ Date 2 _____ Activity _____

Date 3 _____ Activity _____ Date 4 _____ Activity _____

Indicate results of monitoring activities:

Date 1 _____ Result _____ Date 2 _____ Result _____

Date 3 _____ Result _____ Date 4 _____ Result _____

Check which state goals this CANAL goal is related to:

State Mandated Goal:

__ Improve 12th grade graduation rate
__ Improve attendance
__ Reduce failure rate
__ Improve achievement

State Priority Goal:

__ Assure achievement proficiency
__ Assure attendance and graduation rates
__ Assure student preparation for further education and life
__ Assure student preparation for employment
__ Provide common learning experiences and high expectations

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chicago Public Schools — PROJECT CANAL — Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs

Form 1a — SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN — Page _____

Additional Goal: — Curriculum area _____

1989-90 Objective: _____

Rationale or information base: _____

Describe monitoring and evaluation plan: _____

Schedule monitoring activites:

Date 1 _____ Activity _____ Date 2 _____ Activity _____

Date 3 _____ Activity _____ Date 4 _____ Activity _____

Indicate results of monitoring activities:

Date 1 _____ Result _____ Date 2 _____ Result _____

Date 3 _____ Result _____ Date 4 _____ Result _____

Check which state goals this CANAL goal is related to:

State Mandated Goal:
- __ Improve 12th grade graduation rate
- __ Improve attendance
- __ Reduce failure rate
- __ Improve achievement

State Priority Goal:
- __ Assure achievement proficiency
- __ Assure attendance and graduation rates
- __ Assure student preparation for further education and life
- __ Assure student preparation for employment
- __ Provide common learning experiences and

CANAL Goal:
- __ Improve Q of I through staff training
- __ Create and maintain positive educational climate
- __ Develop school based management
- __ Increase student participation in academic activit
- __ Increase student achievement

Chicago Public Schools | Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs | Project CANAL

Form 2a

Page _____

Project CANAL Goal:

Curriculum area _____

1989-90 Objective: _____

_____

Evaluation of Objective: _____

Program and evaluation Activity/Strategy description	Implementation Dates	Person responsible	Implementation/Evaluation Progress Notes (Ongoing documents: xx)

Chicago Public Schools | Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs | Project CANAL

Form 3a

Page _____

Project CANAL Goal:

Curriculum area _____

(Same as Form 1 and Form 2)
1989-90 Objective: _____

_____

Tentative
1990-91 Objective: _____

_____

Tentative
1991-92 Objective: _____

_____

Tentative
1992-93 Objective: _____

_____

Form 4 School_____ Unit_____

1989-90 Project CANAL Budget Request

Correlated to Objective:_____

_____ See page_____

Requests for Staff Positions:		Budget classification *
_____ Teachers @ $45,698	_____	230-149-____-5110
_____ Aides @ $22,011	_____	230-149-____-5210
_____ SCRs @ $22,333	_____	230-149-____-5210
_____ Clerks @ $25,180	_____	230-149-____-5210
_____ Substitutes @ $68/Day	_____	230-149-____-5150
_____ Hours Extended Day @ $30 (Teacher)	_____	230-149-____-5113
_____ Hours Extended Day @ $15 (Career service)	_____	230-149-____-5213

Staff Cost Subtotal _____

* Provide a program code that accurately describes the curriculum area for this expenditure. Please refer to established Board program codes.

(continued on reverse side)

1989-90 Project CANAL Budget
(Continued)

Requests for Non-staff items:		Budget classification *
Textbooks	_____	230-149-____-5310
Supplies	_____	230-149-____-5320
Food	_____	230-149-____-5340
Professional services	_____	230-149-____-5410
Parent stipends	_____	230-149-____-5411
Dues, fees, registration	_____	230-149-____-5420
Repair/maintenance	_____	230-149-____-5470
Conferences, travel	_____	230-149-____-5500
Student transportation	_____	230-149-____-5510
Equipment	_____	230-149-____-5730
Other	_____	230-149-____-____
Other	_____	230-149-____-____
Non-staff Subtotal	_____	
GRAND TOTAL	_____	

* Provide a program code that accurately describes the curriculum area for this expenditure. Please refer to established Board program codes.

1989-90 Project CANAL Budget
(Continued)

Requests for Non-staff items:		Budget classification
Textbooks	_____	230-149-x x x x-5310
Supplies	_____	230-149-x x x x-5320
Food	_____	230-149-x x x x-5340
Professional services	_____	230-149-x x x x-5410
Parent stipends	_____	230-149-x x x x-5411
Dues, fees, registration	_____	230-149-x x x x-5420
Repair/maintenance	_____	230-149-x x x x-5470
Conferences, travel	_____	230-149-x x x x-5500
Student transportation	_____	230-149-x x x x-5510
Equipment	_____	230-149-x x x x-5730
Other	_____	230-149-x x x x- _ _ _ _
Other	_____	230-149-x x x x- _ _ _ _
Non-staff Subtotal	_____	
GRAND TOTAL	_____	

School_____ Unit_____

1989-90 Project CANAL Budget Request

TOTAL BUDGET

	Requests for Staff Positions:		Budget classification
_____	Teachers @ $45,698	_____	230-149-x x x x-5110
_____	Aides @ $22,011	_____	230-149-x x x x-5210
_____	SCRs @ $22,333	_____	230-149-x x x x-5210
_____	Clerks @ $25,180	_____	230-149-x x x x-5210
_____	Substitutes @ $68/Day	_____	230-149-x x x x-5150
_____	Hours Extended Day @ $30 (Teacher)	_____	230-149-x x x x-5113
_____	Hours Extended Day @ $15 (Career service)	_____	230-149-x x x x-5213
	Staff Cost Subtotal	_____	

(continued on reverse side)

APPENDIX FIVE

A DIRECTORY OF MONITORING COMMISSION CRITERIA EMPLOYED IN THE SUBSTANTIVE AUDIT OF 1989-90 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

A DIRECTORY OF MONITORING COMMISSION CRITERIA EMPLOYED IN THE SUBSTANTIVE AUDIT OF 1989-90 PROJECT CANAL SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Legend	Substantive Criterion
A	The SIP provides detail that denotes that the Core Planning Team is aware that the chronology of community events and the current status of their school are inexorably linked.
B	The SIP reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that the concerns, educational priorities, and goals of the school must focus on what CANAL can ultimately accomplish in the school and in the community.
C	The SIP indicates that the Core Planning Team is aware that the educational priorities of the school must give prominence to ultimate CANAL goals.
D	The SIP contains school-wide data arrays that complement the educational priorities of the school, as expressed in the MISSION Section of the School Improvement Plan.
E	The SIP contains district-wide data arrays that complement the educational priorities of the school, as expressed in the MISSION Section of the SIP.
F	Attainment of the SIP objectives will significantly satisfy the purposes of CANAL that are embedded within the goal statements provided by the CANAL staff.
G	The projected outcomes of the SIP objectives are attainable; they can be met with reasonable effort.
H	The data used to support SIP objectives is data found in the INFORMATION BASE DATA Section of the School Improvement Plan.
I	The SIP objectives are focused on a legitimate CANAL target population.
J	The SIP objectives are quantifiable.
K	The SIP objectives reflect educational priorities that are explicated in the MISSION Section of the School Improvement Plan.
L	School created SIP goals correspond to the overall purposes of CANAL.
M	The SIP monitoring plan will yield data that is not susceptible to multiple interpretation.
N	The SIP monitoring plan will allow for a determination of whether or not the SIP objectives have been attained.
O	The SIP monitoring plan will provide data in a timely fashion for Core Planning Team and CANAL staff decisions regarding SIP progress.

P If fully implemented, the SIP implementation activities will permit attainment of the relevant objectives included in the SIP.

Q The SIP activities will be completed in time to contribute effects to the SIP monitoring/evaluation strategy.

R The SIP implementation activities will be evaluated in such a fashion that the Core Planning Team and the Canal staff are able to unequivocally determine that they contribute to the attainment of the objectives included in the School Improvement Plan.

S The resources being requested are the resources necessary to initiate the activities proposed by the School Improvement Plan.

T The resources being requested reflect acquisitions that are durable; their effects will still be in place or will last beyond the term of the CANAL project.

U The indications of congruence between the SIP objectives and State of Illinois mandates are valid.

V The SIP reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that they must continuously monitor their decision-making processes to ensure that the goals of shared decision-making and shared governance are being met.

W The SIP reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that they represent constituencies and that they must continuously provide a communications loop with those constituencies.

X The SIP reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that their role as a representative of school constituencies needs to be continuously monitored to ensure its focused presence.

Y The SIP reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that their decisions need to be documented and communicated to the CANAL staff on a regularized basis and that they are required to provide CANAL staff with two progress reports in January and June 1990.

Z The SIP budget reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that they should not be over committed to new employee positions.

A' The SIP reflects a Core Planning Team awareness that CANAL funds will end and that they must have a process in place that will permit them to discuss, investigate, and decide on alternative sources of SIP support for the 1993-94 school year and beyond.

B' The SIP contains a proper ratio of objectives focused on students.

C' The SIP contains implementation activities that are truly innovative.

D' Model Cluster School SIP's contains implementation activities that focus on the fact that their improvement plans must be capable of attracting voluntary student transfers from nearby over utilized schools.

E' The SIP for Westinghouse High School contains specialized for this school in terms of the unique objectives detailed for this school in the CANAL proposal.

F The SIPs of the District Laboratory Schools reflects their previous involvement in the Secretary of Education discretionary grant program.

G The SIP for the Guggenheim School reflects their previous involvement in a specialized economics education/marketing program.

H A determination as to whether or not the school SIP met sufficient number of substantive criteria to be considered acceptable to the Commission.

I The number of substantive criteria met by the SIP.

J The percentage of possible substantive criteria met by the SIP.